



City of Seattle
Seattle Department of Neighborhoods
Bernie Matsuno, Director

SWEDISH MEDICAL CENTER CHERRY HILL CAMPUS MAJOR INSTITUTIONS MASTER PLAN CITIZEN'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE

SWEDISH MEDICAL CENTER
SWEDISH MEDICAL CENTER
CHERRY HILL CAMPUS
MAJOR INSTITUTIONS
MASTER PLAN CITIZEN'S
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Committee Members

Katie Porter, Chair

Leon Garnett

Dylan Glosecki

Maja Hadlock

Ralieg Watts

J. Elliot Smith

Laurel Spelman

Majo Hadlock

Linda Carrol

*Swedish Medical
Center Non-
management
Representative*

Patrick Angus

David Letrondo

Lara Branigan

Committee Alternates

James Schell

Dean Patton

Ashleigh Kilcup

Ex-officio Members

Steve Sheppard

*Department of
Neighborhoods*

Stephanie Haines

*Department of
Planning and
Development*

Andy Cosentino

*Swedish Medical
Center Management*

Cristina Van Valkenburgh

*Seattle Department of
Transportation*

DRAFT Meeting Notes

Meeting #19

September 30, 2014

Swedish Medical Center

Swedish Cherry Hill Campus

550 17th Avenue

Swedish Cherry Hill Auditorium – A Level

Members and Alternates Present

Dean Patton

Dylan Glosecki

Dave Letrondo

Leon Garnett

Laurel Spellman

Lara Branigan

Laurel Spelman

James Schell

J Elliot Smith

Releigh Watts

Linda Carol

Patrick Angus

Members and Alternates Absent

Katie Porter

Ex-Officio Members Present

Steve Sheppard, DON

Stephanie Haines, DPD

Andy Cosentino, SMC

Christina Van Valkenburgh, SDOT

(See sign-in sheet)

I. Welcome and Introductions

Mr. Dylan Glosecki opened the meeting and briefly introduced Mr. Steve Sheppard for some initial comments. Mr. Sheppard had asked the committee members about the meeting notes and urged the members to review them carefully. Mr. Sheppard stated that going forward it will be more formal process and there will be sign in sheets for members make sure who is eligible to vote. Secondly, Mr. Sheppard the formal process involves establishing formal positions on the final report and taking actions using the Robert Rules of parliamentary procedures. Third, Mr. Sheppard mentioned about another set of minutes to review and approved and that is Meeting #16 that came into two parts.

Mr. Glosecki asked the members to review the minutes and send any mark ups to Steve and the set of meeting minutes will be discussed in the next meeting.

II. SMC Presentations

Mr. Glosecki introduced Mr. Andy Cosentino to begin the presentation. Mr. Cosentino began by commenting about what he heard from the previous meetings regarding the footprint on the campus, design guidelines and how to move forward to mitigate traffic impacts. Mr. Cosentino stated that before diving into the TMP review, he would like to have Mr. John Jex to do a brief update regarding the final preliminary MIMP.

Preliminary Final MIMP

Mr. John Jex began his presentation by illustrating the model of reduced heights on 15th and 16th and 18th avenue and the conversation regarding changing future alternatives and introducing Alternative 11 that incorporates the last conversation in the previous meeting that includes reduced heights, allocation of area over the properties now controlled by Swedish Medical Center, design guidelines, draft Appendix H that was proposed to include in the final document as recommended by the City and implemented by other institutional sites and architectural characteristics to review.

Also in Alternative 11 includes conversation about neighborhood amenities, landscape area, open space, day care center, wellness center on 15th, a landscape buffer between 18th and 19th avenues, linkage to 17th avenue through the campus north south, linkage east to west on 15th to 18th through the campus, and the new TMP conversations.

Mr. Jex had a question to Ms. Stephanie Haines regarding the west block and how the City would like to condition down the 160 ft. to be 150 ft. on 15th and 125 ft. on 16th. Ms. Haines stated that the proposal on the document description is appropriate, and assure the intent to have the lower height on 16th by a single height designation.

A question was raised regarding what is meant by conditioning down. Mr. Jex responded by stating that a property as a whole block is called MIO 160 and the intent not to build 160 is one of the designated choices and set a condition not to build to 160 and not agree to build higher than 150 ft. on 15th and not higher than 125 ft. at the midpoint on 16th avenue.

A comment was made if this will be in the agenda with detailed discussion on future meetings. Mr. Sheppard stated that Children's, Virginia Mason and Seattle University did the same process in conditioning down the MIO by establishing MIO height. The City Council can condition on the Master Plan and they can do so in the design guidelines. Mr. Sheppard noted that it will be discussed in more details towards the final report about the condition down to a lower height.

Revised TMP Discussion

Mr. Cosentino began the TMP discussion by introducing Mike Rimoin, the vice chair of the Integrated Transportation Board (ITB). Mr. Rimoin is from CommuteSeattle along with partnership with King County and downtown Seattle; the goal is to reduce traffic congestion, assist Swedish in their transportation management plan. Mr. Rimoin began his presentation by providing a status update on where there are now in the process, the work that has been done and upcoming work in the future.

Mr. Rimoin stated that the current TMP goal is 50% and the last time the campus did a survey, it was at 56%. The ITB is working through different groups around the campus through a number of policy shifts, education outreach activities in order to reach the TMP

goal. Currently, educational outreach, communication about existing amenities, transportation fairs, workshops and seminars on how to use the current transportation technology, bicycle 101, vanpools, bus pass, and ORCA sign ins are some of the activities that has been happening on campus. There was a survey conducted last week by the CTR to determine where the Swedish Medical Group are in their 50% goal. In the next survey, all groups will be surveyed at the same time.

Mr. Rimoin stated that the biggest challenge for the ITB was having every group on campus, the neighbors and stakeholders sit down and talk about these issues and identify policies that can work in order to move and speed the conversation.

Mr. Rimoin listed the ITB priorities as follows: 1) unified set of policies on parking; 2) TMP compliance; 3) anticipating transportation networks; 4) cultural shifts not just with the TMP goal but within the people.

The ITB have had a number of meetings to review the current conditions and map out the different employers and different groups around campus and the different transportation policies. Last month, work groups were formed and achieved three policies to discuss and implement; these are: 1) employee parking policies; 2) vendor parking policies; and 3) live close to work program.

The work group came together to hash out the details, and prepared a draft form regarding parking enforcement services, a neighborhood park line and website, a draft vendor parking policies that is similar to the employee parking policies, live close to work program and seeking consultants and partnerships with similar institution in the area regarding neighborhood patrols, working with neighborhood groups to explore RPZ.

The ITB discussed about working with local community groups, other RPZ zones in Seattle that has limitation on when to park. The board also discussed about expanding shuttle operations as a critical piece of the puzzle to solve the transportation problems which includes continuing the existing shuttle routes to Westlake center and create a new shuttle route.

Mr. Cosentino made a comment on some of these elements stating that about \$1.3 million has been spent on shuttles, purchase orders in response to the reduction of services done by Metro. The first trial is going over Westlake and other routes including the train station and the Colman dock. It will be a 13 hour service and this is just a beginning to a much broader and larger goal. Mr. Cosentino mentioned about the request for the neighbors to think about some modifications to the RPZ and the contention is for Swedish to come in with enforcement policies for Squire Park and affect employees and vendors, but understood that such vacancy comes a back fill from other staff from Harborview, UW, etc. and the neighborhood can work with Swedish to establish restriction for 0700-1100 permits only. This takes care of the first shift workers from across downtown and are not faced with the same dilemma with other stakeholders moving in the neighborhood. Mr. Cosentino asked for a 60% affirmative from the neighbors to amend the RPZ.

Mr. Cosentino stated that when the West Tower comes online, it will generate traffic congestions and the approach will be the park and shuttle option. Other employers in the area will take a similar approach. There will be plenty of spaces in Issaquah and the shuttle will pick up if you live in that area. Mr. Cosentino also mentioned local churches parking

capacity and leasing those spaces and having ample parking at Ballard or Edmonds and begin a parking shuttle route that will be essential to this strategy.

Regarding the Live Where You Work Program, Mr. Cosentino stated about incentivizing on parking and carpooling and set the goal of SOV going forward. The plan is to have to purchase sufficient buses and capacity in order to bring down the SOV goal that is currently at 46%. This requires finding another bus and another parking lot to bring to the working environment.

Mr. Cosentino stated that the shuttle expansion, bus stops and crosswalks are consistent with the First Hill neighborhood CTR goals set by SDOT. The work with regards to employee policies are near in completion and will share to the committee at the next meeting. Mr. Cosentino emphasized that it will take a comprehensive view point of the subject matter and there is no single solution, but a multi modal solution and Swedish will be very aggressive with it.

Mr. Rimoin stated that the immediate shuttle expansion is in response with the Metro Transit cut reduction.

Mr. Cosentino commented that if there were more connections, people will less likely take mass transit and the goal is to compel more people to take mass transit and by eliminating several connections and amending the routes, the intent is taking out one transfer connection away from people.

Mr. Rimoin stated about streetcars working with greenways, vanpools and van shares and looking at mode shifts in order to get down to 50% and down to 44% CTR goal by using the same kind of ride shares, improvement to transit use and shuttle rout support to connect to their trips are the goals that needs to be met.

Mr. Cosentino stated that these are the options or decisions the employees has to make mentally; the decision to park on the street that can be taken away or use other mode of transportation. Having options that are very limited can maybe change people's behaviors, and this is what the ITB wants to be engage in.

IV. General Committee Discussion

The discussion was then opened by Mr. Glosecki for committee comments on the presentation that was presented.

Revised TMP Discussion

Mr. Gloseck made a comment regarding employees that are caught parking along the neighborhood that they would get a warning and escalate to termination if they cannot abide to the policies. With regards to the vendors, the 1st strike is a warning, 2nd strike will be restriction to come to the business for 30 days and a 3rd strike will be restriction to come to the business for 1 year.

A comment was made if is really true if Harborview staff and other groups come to the neighborhood to park. Mr. Cosentino responded that he does not know that, but a void is created. He stated that Swedish will carry on with the policy and the other option is to design a network of restricted streets where the RPZ are in effect.

A comment was made if RPZ expands to other areas will Swedish pay for the permits. Mr. Cosentino stated that he does not know how far to extend but will go ahead and explore.

A comment was made about an estimate on how many more employees or patient increase in the West Tower. Mr. Cosentino replied by stating it depends on the ultimate height of the building and will build on assumptions. Mr. Jex stated that on Appendix G, the forecast is 277 by 2040.

A comment was made that this is a very aggressive TMP and applaud for taking an aggressive stance. Mr. Cosentino stated that this is the beginning of an investment cycle.

A comment was made if clients or stakeholders, patients and visitors on campus were not part of the analysis and the patient parking problem in the neighborhood. Mr. Cosentino responded by stating that the concept of courtesy value parking for the handicapped and with handicapped placards is the right thing to do.

A comment was made on pay parking not included on the restriction for vendors and employees on the ITB policies. A response was made that there were a lot of tenants that provide parking validation to patients. There has to be an expanded communication to let parking attendants know that Swedish patients have access to discounted parking rates.

A comment was made to amend the TMP to include these discussions.

A comment was made regarding patient access to shuttles. Mr. Cosentino responded that shuttles are open to patients and employees and there will be a communication sent that would inform the patients.

A comment was made about patient care on the TMP and it is clearly compelled to do the handicapped courtesy, and it is important to identify the discounts and make it consistent for Cherry Hill and First Hill.

A comment was made that the transportation issues are really important and the plan has a lot of big components to it and a result of a 10 year commitment instead of starting the process all over. The one component, shuttle service, if it is successful enough, will have shuttle runs on an extremely regular schedule.

Mr. Glosecki stated that two decades of zero credibility on parking and no enforcement on these plans and a need to have teeth.

Mr. Cosentino responded by stating that that is where Swedish is heading, with the options, and alternatives being presented and this issue has been taken very seriously. This will be a five year commitment and the enforcement policies will begin to kick off on January 2015.

Mr. Glosecki stated parking policies are great and would like to see the 44% goal to be reevaluated and reduced it further and not stop at 44%. Mr. Cosentino responded by stating his commitment to continuous improvement.

Ms. Spellman made a comment if the policies applies to First Hill as well. Mr. Cosentino responded that because of the seriousness of neighborhood parking at Cherry Hill that it will be only at Cherry Hill. The vendor and employee policies will remain in Cherry Hill.

Ms. Spellman stated that this was a good start to the plan and encourage to see that a huge amount of work and effort was done due to its history.

Mr. Romoin stated that the shuttle service would help in bringing down the SOV rate.

Mr. Cosentino stated that they will make patients aware with pre-visit instructions and consistently communicating to them about different travel options.

Mr. Sheppard commented that the 50% goal is in line with other major institutions, and would like to make sure that Alternative 11 in which the height is lower reflects the discussion and the basis for the preliminary EIS.

A comment was made that this is an extremely aggressive plan and was very impressed with the approach.

Mr. Glosecki summarized the TMP by stating that it would look into patient parking, parking on campus, better signage and communication in the future, shuttle service, employee parking policies and enforcing not just a 44% goal needs to be reevaluated.

Alternative 11 General Committee Discussions

Mr. Glosecki commented that on Alternative 11, the half block definitely needs to come down where it was and it should be 37 ft. as an appropriate scale.

Mr. Cosentino stated that is an option worth exploring with different elevation and a thought process, transferring the square footage and smoothing out the building and leveling the area.

A comment was made that having a roof that people can have lunch and looking down at a people's yard is not desirable.

Mr. Jex briefly explained the roof deck in the design guidelines that illustrates the purpose of privacy by creating a landscape edge to the roof deck to keep the visitors away and the height focus view will be upward and not downward thus avoiding looking at the neighbor's yard.

Mr. Cosentino stated to make another amendment. Mr. Glosecki stated to keep under 37 ft. and having a roof deck amenity is a benefit but looking at a neighbor's backyard is a concern. Mr. Cosentino suggested the roof top at 37 ft. and push it back away from the edge.

A comment was made that there are no other options to decrease, the best option of 160 ft. and make it smaller to 150 ft. The best way to mitigate the traffic is to lessen the square feet and that is the compromise.

Mr. Sheppard stated that the heights is too great, decrease the overall square footage, establish FAR's, establish the need and define it in order the community to accommodate height, bulk, scale and traffic appropriate.

A comment was made that the height, bulk, scale is inappropriate for this neighborhood.

Mr. Glosecki stated that the location for the height is too great.

A comment was made that the main problem is that the project is too huge, too big, too high, too bulky and ugly.

Mr. Glosecki asked what an appropriate height is. A response was made stating that something that scales within the 105 ft. range that preserves the neighborhood and does not dwarfs it.

A comment was made that in the last meeting and looking at the model that these were the highest height modulation and is very happy that it is now moving in the right direction. Both sides needs to come together towards cooperation and concessions in order to come into an alignment.

A comment was made that the community is not happy to the 3.1 million sq. ft. that was presented.

Mr. Cosentino stated that 18 months ago it began at 3.1 million sq. ft. and the current status now stands at 2.75 million sq. ft. and in order to achieve that the construction must be below ground. The CAC restricted expansion, restricted height by default, restricted bulk. Recently, took the tower at 35 ft. and took the 18th avenue construction down. In the previous meetings, there was no problem with 160 ft. central tower for replacement of beds and the CAC members has no issue with the 160 ft. tower.

Mr. Glosecki stated that it was a consensus among CAC members but it is not final.

A comment was made that the east side of 18th avenue needs to bring down to 37 ft. and it is nice to look at the mountains and sky lines and not near at people's houses.

Mr. Glosecki stated that it is a good point of view to the east is really nice having a public access roof top amenities.

A comment was made regarding negotiation that at 1st option of a 240 ft. tall building has gone down to 90 ft. and things have changed at a reasonable amount.

IV. Public Comments

The meeting was then opened by Mr. Glosecki for public comments.

Comments from Robert Schwartz: Mr. Schwartz is an Associate Vice President of Facilities for the Seattle University, and he stated that he has in meetings with Swedish and Sabey behind the scenes, reviewed the model and addressed a number of concerns about the previous proposal such as building heights, setbacks, massing and articulation, circulation and activity and street activation. He stated that there has been significant progress on building heights on 15th and 16th which was not supported on the original proposal. There has been significant progress in the direction of building setbacks along 18th which he find is appropriate and supportive. There has been significant concessions regarding massing and articulation and believes that it is appropriate in those areas. Mr. Schwartz would like to see more circulation and activity along 15th and agree that the corner is a challenging street. Overall, Mr. Schwartz stated that Swedish and Sabey made significant movement and encouraged the CAC members to review these proposals favorably and move forward with appropriate conditions.

Comments from Julie Popper: Ms. Popper represents the SEIU Healthcare 1199 northwest, it is a union of nurses and healthcare workers for all Swedish campuses. She stated her support of the physician's paperwork that was submitted to the director stating that this is not First Hill and this is not downtown and it does not have the infrastructure of First Hill or

downtown to support these transportation proposals. She stated that rolling the two campuses together is unrealistic given the fact about the current bus cuts. She noted that the Swedish shuttle is full now and mentioned that shift workers does not get off work on time and that the shuttle should be available all the time. The shuttle should be a 24/7 around the clock operation. There should be a realistic approach to address these problems. She stated that the solution regarding parking and transportation should not demonizing the employees; and the only solution is to provide a quality transit infrastructure, walkable street car options.

Comments from Sochi M: Ms. Sochi is from the Washington Community Action Network and she stated impact of traffic to low income communities and colored people are way too great. There needs to build an appropriate scale to mitigate traffic impacts. She stated about having a sit down with the neighbors to come up with real agreements to address these concerns.

Comments from Jack Hansen: Mr. Hansen lives on 209 22nd avenue at Squire Park. He stated about the creative ideas presented about the TMP, but is very skeptical about the credibility of the plan. He disagreed with Mr. Letrondo's comment about the \$300,000 a year cost to mitigate traffic and it is not a real commitment. The real issue is trying to deal with the impact of these massive expansion to the neighborhood. He stated that this is a single-family homes with two lane street and mentioned that putting a lipstick on a pig would still remain a pig. He reminded the CAC that the message from the community remained consistent since the very beginning that the scope and scale of this project is inappropriate to this neighborhood. He encouraged the CAC to reject the proposed MIMP and send it back to the drawing board and start over. The neighborhood have not seen any significant improvement on these current proposals. He stated to reject and send these back to the drawing board and the community will support them on that.

Comments from Marie Anderson: lives across the street from the Jefferson Tower, and she stated that a 105 ft. campus right now is already too big and too tall for this neighborhood.

Comments from Joy Jacobsen: Ms. Jacobsen stated that this proposal is out of scale and should come down, and that there has been progress to the right direction but it is not quite there yet.

Comments from Abel Bradshaw: Ms. Bradshaw stated that the first proposal about the complete destruction of every house on the west side and having an enormous building to be built on the north side of Cherry brought the neighborhood in tears. She stated that most people sitting in the room understood clearly that alternative 1 is false and pretended that Swedish were all in negotiations and that the only individuals being compromised in this room are the neighbors.

Comments from Troy Myers: Mr. Myers stated that he agreed on the statements made by the neighbors and has been consistent that this campus is not First Hill. It is not an urban village and does not have the same amount of transit and not close to downtown. The suggestion of having a neighborhood watch and a RPZ amendment sounds good, but questioned about shifting the burden to the neighborhood, and that it should not be all on the neighbors. Mr. Myers stated about the live close to work option and it is troubled by this concept and how it affects the employees that no longer works at Swedish, and how will they be subsidized. He noted that Sabey is a vendor and if the vendor policies applies to them.

Also, he noted that there will be significant construction projects that will impact the livability on the neighborhood and having trucks and construction vehicles idling at 7:00 am for a long period of time is detrimental to the people's health and the streets.

Comments from Bob Cooper: Mr. Cooper stated in the last meeting, members of the committee were given a survey about what they thought about the model that was sitting on the table. The same questions were given to the neighbors and asked the questions about the health walk, definition of pedestrian scales and provided rating scales. People were invited to indicate their responses, and Mr. Cooper mentioned that the racial mix up is split and find that they have a good distribution of the participants from the neighborhood. The majority of the responders have been to these meetings and Mr. Cooper stated that what he heard from the neighbors are that they do not care about the amenities and are neutral and not interested. Regarding the height and scale progress, the neighbors responded with average interest because of little or no progress that has been presented. Mr. Cooper stated that there will be tremendous traffic that will be generated from these proposals and the committee should consider what the neighbors want and the neighbors do not care about the amenities because of the little or no progress that was being presented.

Mr. Glosecki questioned about how the neighbors were sought out. Mr. Copper responded through organizing, collecting email addresses, and the comments were solicited on Facebook, and some neighbors identified themselves and some are not. Mr. Cooper stated that he will provided a copy to the committee, and stressed that it is not quite the racial balance of the neighborhood.

A comment was made about the information provided was good and was wondering why do they do not care about daycare in the neighborhood. Mr. Cooper stated that he was very enthusiastic about having daycare 20 years ago, but it did not come to pass. Mr. Cooper would like to see, when it will be built, certain things are not allowed to happen unless certain goals are met.

Mr. Glosecki commented about his surprised about people not wanting amenities, and Mr. Cooper responded that it is what he is hearing from the people that showed up in these meetings.

Mr. Sheppard made a comment about having the City Council and DPD can make recommendations prior to Project X or Y to occur.

Comments from Merlyn Maywater: Ms. Maywater lives on 45th and Madison and not a near neighbor. She stated that she is an activist for the Seattle Neighborhood Greenway to promote healthier transportation. She noted that such efforts should not be limited to meet the demands of the community, but it should be part of the mission. Swedish is a healthcare organization and it should encourage to embrace the goal of active transportation and should be an integral part of the institution. She hopes that Swedish encourages transit users the same way they encourage their employees using the parking garage and should embrace transit reimbursements for employees. She questioned about the transportation plan and the increase in shuttle services for patients and staff is nice but it does not benefit the rest of the community. She stated that Swedish should put more money on transportation options that would benefit everybody in the community.

Comments from Cindy Thelen: Ms. Halen lives on 545 19th avenue. She stated that she supports the comments made by her neighbors and mentioned the mistrust that exist between the institution and the neighborhood. Alternative 11 was not presented to the public. She stated that she does not want a public rooftop and a garage by her house that would invade her privacy. She is not excited about the daycare center and she kept saying over and over in these meetings for over a year and a half that the height, bulk, scale, and density are out of scale and it is way too big.

Comments from Vicki Schiantarelli: Ms. Schiantarelli stated a couple of points about the required transportation investments that Sabey bought two remaining homeowners out along 18 avenue and paid 1.5 million apiece a paid out 3 million to move out to acquire the property. Under the code, it requires a 25 ft. minimum setback, the problem was asking zero for exemptions but loaded with exemption requests. She stated that the transportation investment spent is not really much. She showed viewpoint pictures that shows the building and foundation and how the ground level would look different at a 2nd story bedroom window and the only view will be the sky and nothing else. She stated that the amenities are offensive and they do not have mitigation for these amenities.

Comments from Greg Harmon: Mr. Harmon lives on 19th and Cherry and he agreed to what Ms. Halen stated. The proposal started with 3.1 million sq. ft and it came down to 2.7 and it has not move since then, and it is not a negotiation. He stated that it does not have enough infrastructure space here. He mentioned that there has been good progress in the TMP compared to 20 years of doing nothing. It is difficult to integrate the plan and that the TMP goals needs to have more teeth

Comment from Lori Lucky: Ms. Lucky lives on 916 17th avenue and she stated that she agreed with her neighbors that was stated at this meeting. When the meeting started, Ms. Lucky stated that she heard Mr. Cosentino saying about the traffic impact, but it is not the primary thing the neighborhood want to hear. Ms. Lucky stated that bulk, height, and size of the buildings are the primary concerns. She also questioned about what kind of traffic that will be coming into the neighborhood. Also, she stated about parking consequences and the termination of employees, and if there is hierarchy involved and will doctors be terminated or it only applies to nurses, CNA's, etc. She stated that she do not like this project and there is no compromise to this kind of project.

Comment form Sonya Richter: Ms. Richter lives on 17th and Marion since 1985. She stated that she agrees with her neighbors that this is not downtown. This is not a negotiation but a power play by a large institution that has money and a neighborhood that does not have money. She stated that this project is too big for this site and the whole transportation plan is difficult to find a solution

Comment from an anonymous person: The anonymous person stated that she lives on Squire Park and stated that this campus is not an urban village and does not have the infrastructure to handle the current plan. She noted that Swedish/Sabey complex should be located in an urban village that has an appropriate transportation such as Rapid Transit. This project puts a lot of pressure to the neighborhood street that would bring gridlock and negatively affect the neighborhood. She encourages the CAC to reconsider the proposal.

Comment from Mary Pat: Ms. Pat stated that the comments made by the representative from Seattle University is irrelevant because of its vested interest on the project. She stated

that the message by the neighbors that have been attending these meetings has been consistent and that the simple solution is do not build this project. She noted that it has nothing to do with the hospital, but the gridlock it will bring to the neighborhood according to the DEIS. She stated that this is profit development and they are not here to help Sabey.

Comment Linda: Ms. Linda is an employee from the campus and lives on the neighborhood. She stated her agreement with her neighbors about their frustrations with the lack of movement with this development. She was puzzled about the transportation plan that is being put to the employees. Swedish charges more money for employee passes and carpools and will Swedish starts subsidizing them. She also stated that some employees' starts early shift as early as 5:00 am and they cannot use the transportation or shuttle being proposed.

Mr. Glosecki announced the conclusion of the public comments and asked the committee if they have any further questions. Mr. Patton made a comment that the meeting should stay on schedule so it could end on time. Mr. Sheppard commented that he suggested extra time for public comments as a courtesy.

VII. Adjournment

No further business being before the Committee, the meeting was adjourned.